



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,910	04/04/2001	Serge Muller	14XZ00098	3729

7590

09/24/2002

JAY L. CHASKIN
General Electric Company
3135 Easton Turnpike - W3C
Fairfield, CT 06431

EXAMINER

CHURCH, CRAIG E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2882

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/20/02
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 7 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 8-10, 17-20 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Serial No. 825,910
Art Unit 2882

-2-

It is required under 37 CFR 1.84g that legends be added to the block symbols of figures 4 and 5. Elements 32 and 33 discussed on pages 9 and 10 of the specification are not illustrated in figure 2 as described. Correction is required.

Claims 2-5, 8-10 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are so poorly written that their metes and bounds cannot be ascertained. The limitations conveyed by the following terms or phrases are unclear:

claim 2 --means for recognition--

claim 3 --detection element-- (detect what?)

--adapter-- (adapts what?)

claim 4 --element having a given x-ray absorption removably fixed on the device--

claim 5 --means for coding--

claim 8 --image chain--

--parameters of the object--

--parameters for acquisition--

--parameters of the means for receiving--

--parameters for positioning the device--

--set of rules--

--possibly from one or more parameters chosen by a user--

Serial No. 825,910
Art Unit 2882

-3-

claim 9 --image chain--

--parameters of the object--

--parameters for acquisition--

--parameters of the means for receiving--

--parameters for positioning the device--

--set of rules--

--possibly from one or more parameters chosen by a
user--

claim 10 --element--

claim 17 Words seem to be missing from lines 6 and 7.

claim 18 --coder--

--means for recognition--

claim 19 --image chain--

--parameters of the object--

--parameters for acquisition--

--parameters of the means for receiving--

--parameters for positioning the device--

--set of rules--

--possible from one or more parameters chosen by a
user--

claim 20 --support--

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are allowed.

Applicant's arguments filed August 20, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. The deficiencies in the claims are far more than typographic errors as

Serial No. 825,910
Art Unit 2882

-4-

remarked by applicant. The claims are so poorly written that their metes and bounds cannot be ascertained. For example, what limitation is represented by the phrase --parameters of the object--? Is this the color of a person's eyes? Is --means for coding-- a cryptographic translator? Claims 2-5 have not been amended at all, and claims 8-10 have only been amended superficially (such as changing prepositions).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Church at telephone number (703) 308-4861.

Craig E Church

CRAIG E. CHURCH
Senior Examiner
ART UNIT 2882